DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 771 TM 014 829

AUTHOR Stolworthy, Reed L.
TITLE Teacher Education: The Application of Fisher's LSD Matrix in the Evaluation of Preservice Teachers.
PUB DATE 3 Feb 90
NOTE 69p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Interrater Reliability; *Matrices; *Preservice Teacher Education; Statistical Significance; Student Teacher Evaluation; *Student Teachers; Teacher Evaluation; Teaching Skills; *Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *Levels of Significant Differences (Fisher); *Teacher Competencies

ABSTRACT

The degrees of variance among three groups of evaluators relative to their assessments of the teaching competencies of preservice teacher education students were studied. Subjects included groups of 23 and 32 undergraduates who were certified to teach by the teacher preparation program at Washburn University in Topeka (Kansas) in 1987 and in 1988, respectively. At the end of student teaching, the student, the cooperating teacher, and the university supervisor completed a rating scale containing the same criteria related to the teaching-learning process. A matrix of probabilities was obtained for each competency examined through the multiple comparisons provided in Fisher's levels of significant differences (LSDs). The mean values derived were not, in most cases, significantly different for the three groups of evaluators. The greatest differences, which were not large, were found between students' self-assessments and the evaluations of university supervisors for long-range and daily lesson planning and competence in assessing and interpreting student progress. Appendix A gives the means and standard deviations of the study in 25 tables. Appendix B contains 25 additional tables showing the application of Fisher's LSD matrix. Appendix C is a summary of levels of significance, and Appendix D contains the Follow-Up Performance Rating Scale for Student Teachers. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED318771

TEACHER EDUCATION: THE APPLICATION OF FISHER'S LSD MATRIX IN THE EVALUATION OF PRESERVICE TEACHERS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

REED L. STOLWORTHY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SUBMITTED BY

DR. REED L. STOLWORTHY
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY

FEBRUARY 3, 1990

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM014829

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction. 3

Problem Statement 3

Research Design 4

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Analysis of Variance . . .5

The Level of Significance 6

Conclusion. 8

Appencix A. 9

Tables 1-25

The Mean and Standard Deviation

Appendix B. 35

Tables 26-50

The Analysis of Variance

Multiple Comparisons: Fisher's LSD

A Matrix of Probabilities

Appendix C. 61

Table 51

Summary Table Listing Levels of Significance

Appendix D. 65

The Evaluative Instruments

TEACHER EDUCATION: THE APPLICATION OF FISHER'S LSD MATRIX IN THE EVALUATION OF PRESERVICE TEACHERS

This study of preservice student teachers involved a population of 23 (n = 23) undergraduates certified to teach by Washburn University's teacher preparation program during Fall Semester of 1987 and 32 (n = 32) undergraduates during the Spring semester of 1988 for a total of 55 (N = 55) undergraduates. Data were obtained relative to the undergraduates' self evaluation regarding the ability to demonstrate twenty-five teaching competencies. In addition, the student teaching evaluations completed during the Fall of 1987 and the Spring of 1988 by the above undergraduates' cooperating teacher(s) (n = 26, Fall 1987 and n = 30, Spring 1988) and university supervisor (n = 18, Fall 1987 and n = 28, Spring 1988) were also included regarding the evaluation of the very same teaching-learning competencies.

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine the degree of variance found existing among three different groups of evaluators relative to their assessments of the teaching competencies demonstrated by preservice teacher education students. Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What does the application of the analysis of variance show regarding the student teachers' self-evaluation relative to the competencies related to the teaching-learning process?

2. What does the application of the analysis of variance illustrate relative to the performance of these same student teachers when measured with the same rating scale administered by their respective cooperating teacher(s) and university supervisor(s)?

3. Are there any significant differences between the self-evaluation conducted by the student teachers, and the respective evaluations of these same student teachers by the cooperating teachers and university supervisors relative to the same competencies?

Research Design

Each evaluative instrument utilized in the study was based on a rating scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. The respondents were to check the column labeled NA if they did not observe the undergraduate in a particular competency, and in the case of the undergraduate, NA would be checked if the respondent did not have an opportunity to demonstrate a particular competency (Appendix D).

At the end of student teaching, the student teacher, cooperating teacher,and university supervisor completed the rating scale containing the same criteria related to the teaching-learning process. The data were obtained from the

above and tabulated and analyzed on the computer. The quantitative results were expressed through descriptive and inferential statistics.

It can readily be noticed that the left hand column of tables 1 through 25 (Appendix A) lists the numbers on the rating scale with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. In addition, the respondents were to check NA if they did not observe the undergraduate in a particular competency, and in the case of the undergraduate, NA would be check if the respondent did not have an opportunity to demonstrate a particular competency. The numbers listed across the tables indicate the number of responses received at each of the points on the rating scale by each of the respective groups. The mean values and standard deviations relative to each of the competencies are listed at the bottom of each table.

The Mean, Standard Deviation, and Analysis of Variance

Tables 1 through 25 (Appendix A) show the mean scores and standard deviations for the twenty-five competencies related to teaching as represented by the Fall, 1987 and Spring, 1988
student teachers. Mean scores were obtained in regards to the student teacher's perception of his/her competencies related to the teaching-learning process. Tables 26-50 (Appendix B) illustrate the multiple comparisons of the

above three groups of evaluators as provided through the application of the analysis of variance by using Fisher's levels of significant differences (LSD). A matrix of probabilities was obtained for each competency through the multiple comparisons provided in Fisher's LSD relative to the above
groups of evaluators assessing the competence of the Fall 1987 and Spring 1988 student teachers.

The Level of Significance

Since a (p) value between 0.05 is usually thought of as marginally significant, anything greater was labeled in this study as a nonsignificant difference. Tables 26 through 50 (Appendix B) show the matrix of probabilities illustrated through the application of Fisher's multiple comparisons for each of the mean scores of Fall semester 1987 and Spring Semester 1988 to the mean scores derived from the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors. The variability which occurred within this study was depicted through taking into account the size and location of each individual score in terms of each respective mean score derived from the three groups of respondents. Table 51 (Appendix C) lists the differences found among and within the various mean scores. Fifty comparison were made by selecting the two most significant values derived on each of the twenty five competencies. It can readily be noticed that the assessments of the specific

competencies in the student teachers by the three groups of evaluators were significantly different in only five instances. Thus, no significant differences were derived from the three different groups of evaluators in forty-five of the fifty comparisons. The five instances of significant differences were at or below the .05 level. These particular differences occurred while rating the student teacher on four of the twenty five competencies. Thus, there were no significant differences noted among all the evaluators when the student teachers were rated on the other twenty-one competencies.

Conclusion

The mean values derived from the application of the rating scale by the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors relative to the student teachers' ability to demonstrate competencies related to the teaching-learning process were in most instances not significantly different for the three groups of evaluators. Only five instances were found where significant differences existed below the .05 level of significance.

The greatest differences were found to exist between the evaluations derived from the student teachers and the evaluations obtained from the university supervisors (e.g. p =.01). This particular level dealt with long range and daily lesson planning and also with the competency of assessing and interpreting student progress. The level (e.g. p = .03) was derived between the cooperating teachers and the university supervisors regarding this same competency of assessing and interpreting student progress. Other instances at the .03 level of significance dealt with differences between the student teachers and the university supervisors relative to evaluating the student teachers' participation in school activities and also between the cooperating teachers and university supervisors evaluation of the student teachers' cooperation with the personnel in the school.

APPENDIX A
TABLES 1-25
THE MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION

TABLE 1

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 1-PRACTICES PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	2	0	2	0	1
4	0	9	4	7	0	2
5	13	20	21	20	13	24
Competent						
NA	5	1	1	1	5	1
Mean	5.00	4.58	4.84	4.62	5.00	4.85
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.62	0.37	0.62	0.00	0.46

TABLE 2

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 2-MAINTAINS ENTHUSIASM FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	2	2	2	0
4	4	8	3	5	1	3
5	18	24	21	23	15	25
Competent						
NA	1	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.82	4.75	4.73	4.70	4.72	4.89
Standard Deviation	0.39	0.44	0.60	0.60	0.67	0.31

TABLE 3

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 3-CONFIDENCE IN ABILITY TO TEACH

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	5	3	2	0	0
4	6	11	4	13	8	15
5	17	16	19	14	10	13
Competent						
NA	0	0	6	1	0	0
Mean	4.74	4.34	4.62	4.41	4.56	4.46
Standard Deviation	0.45	0.75	0.70	0.63	0.51	0.51

TABLE 4

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 4-MAINTAINS PROFESSIONAL APPEARANCE

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	2	0	1	0	1
4	2	11	2	7	4	4
5	20	18	24	22	14	23
Competent						
NA	0	1	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.83	4.52	4.92	4.70	4.78	4.79
Standard Deviation	0.49	0.63	0.27	0.53	0.43	0.50

TABLE 5

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 5-COMMUNICATES EFFECTIVELY IN CLASSROOM

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	1	3	1	2	0	0
4	12	12	8	12	6	10
5	10	16	17	15	18	18
Competent						
NA	0	1	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.39	4.42	4.62	4.37	4.67	4.64
Standard Deviation	0.58	0.67	0.57	0.76	0.49	0.49

TABLE 6

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 6-PARTICIPATES IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	1	0	0	0	0
2	1	1	0	0	0	0
3	2	2	3	0	0	2
4	4	7	2	3	3	5
5	8	14	4	11	3	4
Competent						
NA	8	7	17	16	12	17
Mean	4.27	4.28	4.11	4.79	4.50	4.18
Standard Deviation	0.96	1.06	0.93	0.43	0.55	0.75

TABLE 7

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 7-REQUESTS, ACCEPTS, AND PROFITS FROM SUGGESTIONS

Incom-	Student		Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Fall 87	Sp.88	Fall 87	Sp.88	Fall 87	Sp. 88
	N=23	N=32	N=26	N=30	N=18	N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	0	2	2	2	1	0
4	5	6	3	4	5	2
5	16	23	21	23	12	26
Competent						
NA	0	1	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.76	4.68	4.73	4.63	4.61	4.93
Standard						
Deviation	0.44	0.60	0.60	0.76	0.61	0.26

TABLE 8

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 8-PRACTICES PUNCTUALITY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	1	0	2	0	1
4	3	10	4	2	1	2
5	18	21	22	26	16	25
Competent						
NA	1	0	0	0	1	0
Mean	4.77	4.63	4.85	4.80	4.94	4.86
Standard Deviation	0.53	0.55	0.37	0.55	0.24	0.45

TABLE 9

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 9-PARTICIPATES IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	2	1	1	2	0	0
4	6	9	4	5	2	0
5	13	19	20	20	15	25
Competent						
NA	1	3	1	3	1	3
Mean	4.52	4.62	4.76	4.67	4.88	5.00
Standard Deviation	0.68	0.56	0.52	0.62	0.33	0.00

TABLE 10

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 10-USES APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LESSONS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	0	1	0	0
3	1	1	2	1	0	0
4	9	13	3	10	6	5
5	13	17	21	18	12	23
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.52	4.44	4.73	4.50	4.67	4.82
Standard Deviation	0.59	0.72	0.60	0.73	0.49	0.39

TABLE 11

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 11-DETERMINES STUDENT NEEDS AND INTERESTS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	0	2	0	0
3	1	0	2	0	0	0
4	6	15	6	12	8	7
5	16	16	18	16	10	21
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.65	4.44	4.62	4.40	4.56	4.75
Standard Deviation	0.57	0.67	0.64	0.81	0.51	0.44

TABLE 12

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 12-DEVELOPS LONG-RANGE AND DAILY PLANS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	0	0	0	0
3	2	1	1	3	0	0
4	9	13	7	5	4	3
5	12	17	18	22	13	25
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean	4.43	4.44	4.65	4.63	4.76	4.89
Standard Deviation	0.66	0.72	0.56	0.67	0.44	0.31

TABLE 13

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 13-OBTAIN APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87	Sp.88	Fall 87	Sp.88	Fall 87	Sp. 88
	N=23	N=32	N=26	N=30	N=18	N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	2	4	1	3	0	0
4	5	9	6	6	5	2
5	16	19	19	20	13	25
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	1	0	1
Mean	4.61	4.47	4.69	4.59	4.72	4.93
Standard Deviation	0.66	0.72	0.55	0.68	0.46	0.27

TABLE 14

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 14-CHOOSES APPROPRIATE STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	2	2	2	1	1	0
4	9	15	7	6	9	8
5	12	15	17	21	8	20
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mean	4.43	4.41	4.58	4.62	4.39	4.71
Standard Deviation	0.66	0.61	0.64	0.73	0.61	0.46

TABLE 15

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 15-PRESENTS LESSONS EFFECTIVELY

Incom-petent	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	0	3	1	2	1	0
4	10	14	5	7	7	8
5	13	15	20	20	10	20
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.57	4.38	4.73	4.53	4.50	4.71
Standard Deviation	0.51	0.66	0.53	0.78	0.62	0.46

TABLE 16

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 16-MANAGES CLASSROOM FACILITIES EFFECTIVELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	2	0	0
3	1	3	0	3	0	0
4	5	13	7	7	5	6
5	17	16	19	18	13	22
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.70	4.41	4.73	4.37	4.72	4.79
Standard Deviation	0.56	0.67	0.45	0.93	0.46	0.42

TABLE 17

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 17-MANAGES CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR EFFECTIVELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	2	0	0
3	2	5	3	3	3	0
4	10	18	9	9	4	9
5	11	9	14	16	11	19
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.39	4.13	4.42	4.30	4.44	4.68
Standard Deviation	0.66	0.66	0.70	0.92	0.78	0.48

TABLE 18

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 18-DEVELOP APPROPRIATE EVALUATION DEVICES

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	5	2	2	0	0	0
4	8	15	6	10	6	3
5	9	13	17	16	9	25
Competent						
NA	1	2	1	4	3	0
Mean	4.18	4.37	4.60	4.62	4.60	4.89
Standard Deviation	0.80	0.61	0.65	0.50	0.51	0.31

TABLE 19

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 19-ASSESSES AND INTERPRETS STUDENT PROGRESS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	2	3	2	3	0	1
4	7	13	7	7	4	3
5	13	16	17	19	14	24
Competent						
NA	1	0	0	1	0	0
Mean	4.50	4.41	4.58	4.55	4.78	4.82
Standard Deviation	0.67	0.67	0.64	0.69	0.43	0.48

TABLE 20

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 20-WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS CULTURES

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	1	0	1	0	0
4	2	5	3	3	0	2
5	16	17	16	15	16	18
Competent						
NA	5	9	7	11	2	8
Mean	4.89	4.70	4.84	4.74	5.00	4.90
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.56	0.37	0.56	0.00	0.31

TABLE 21

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 21-WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS

Incom-	Student Teaches		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	0	2	1	1	0	0
4	9	6	4	5	4	4
5	10	19	16	17	11	12
Competent						
NA	4	5	5	6	3	12
Mean	4.53	4.63	4.71	4.58	4.73	4.75
Standard Deviation	0.51	0.63	0.56	0.78	0.46	0.45

TABLE 22

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 22-DEVELOPS RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	0	2	2	2	0	0
4	4	4	4	2	3	2
5	19	26	20	25	15	26
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.83	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.83	4.93
Standard Deviation	0.39	0.57	0.62	0.75	0.38	0.26

TABLE 23

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 23-COUNSELS STUDENTS APPROPRIATELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	0	2	1	2	0	0
4	9	15	4	4	3	4
5	14	15	21	21	11	19
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	2	4	5
Mean	4.61	4.41	4.77	4.61	4.79	4.83
Standard Deviation	0.50	0.61	0.51	0.79	0.43	0.39

TABLE 24

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 24-COOPERATES WITH ALL SCHOOL PERSONNEL

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	0	0	1	0	0	0
4	3	4	3	3	0	2
5	20	28	22	26	18	26
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.87	4.88	4.81	4.80	5.00	4.93
Standard Deviation	0.34	0.34	0.49	0.61	0.00	0.26

TABLE 25

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 25-MAINTAINS APPROPRIATE PERSONAL BEHAVIOR, SELF-CONTROL, OPEN MINDEDNESS, FLEXIBILITY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 87 N=23	Sp.88 N=32	Fall 87 N=26	Sp.88 N=30	Fall 87 N=18	Sp. 88 N=28
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	0	0	1	1	0	0
4	7	6	4	5	2	2
5	16	25	21	23	16	26
Competent						
NA	0	1	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.70	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.89	4.93
Standard Deviation	0.47	0.40	0.51	0.71	0.32	0.26

APPENDIX B
TABLES 26-50
THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE, MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

TABLE 26

PRACTICES PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.959	**.813
Cooperating Teachers	.959	1.000	*.670
University Supervisors	**.813	*.670	1.000

*p< .670 or .67 level of significance

**p< .813 or .81 level of significance

TABLE 27

MAINTAINS ENTHUSIASM FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.690	.968
Cooperating Teachers	**.690	1.000	*.564
University Supervisors	.968	*.564	1.000

*p< .564 or .56 level of significance

**p< .690 or .69 level of significance

TABLE 28

CONFIDENCE IN THE ABILITY TO TEACH

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.993	*.989
Cooperating Teachers	**.993	1.000	1.000
University Supervisors	*.989	1.000	1.000

*p< .989 or .99 level of significance

**p< .993 or .99 level of significance

TABLE 29

MAINTAINS PROFESSIONAL APPEARANCE

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.715	**.793
Cooperating Teachers	*.715	1.000	.989
University Supervisors	**.793	.989	1.000

*p< .715 or .72 level of significance

**p< .793 or .79 level of significance

TABLE 30

COMMUNICATES EFFECTIVELY IN THE CLASSROOM

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.715	*.198
Cooperating Teachers	.715	1.000	**.416
University Supervisors	*.198	**.416	1.000

*p< .198 or .20 level of significance

**p< .416 or.42 level of significance

TABLE 31

PARTICIPATES IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.856	.980
Cooperating Teachers	*.856	1.000	**.939
University Supervisors	.980	**.939	1.000

*p< .856 or .86 level of significance

**p< .939 or.94 level of significance

TABLE 32

REQUESTS, ACCEPTS, AND PROFITS FROM SUGGESTIONS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.962	**.940
Cooperating Teachers	.962	1.000	*.825
University Supervisors	**.940	*.825	1.000

*p< .825 or .83 level of significance

**p< .940 or.94 level of significance

TABLE 33

PRACTICES PUNCTUALITY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.329	*.135
Cooperating Teachers	**.329	1.000	.609
University Supervisors	*.135	.609	1.000

*p< .135 or .14 level of significance

**p< .329 or.33 level of significance

TABLE 34

PARTICIPATES IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.288	*.034
Cooperating Teachers	.288	1.000	**.120
University Supervisors	*.034	**.120	1.000

*p< .034 or .03 level of significance

**p< .120 or.12 level of significance

TABLE 35

USES APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LESSONS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.577	*.223
Cooperating Teachers	**.577	1.000	.597
University Supervisors	*.223	.597	1.000

*p< .223 or .22 level of significance

**p< .577 or.58 level of significance

TABLE 36

DETERMINES STUDENT NEEDS AND INTERESTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.974	**.772
Cooperating Teachers	.974	1.000	*.656
University Supervisors	**.772	*.656	1.000

*p< .656 or .66 level of significance

**p< .772 or.77 level of significance

TABLE 37

DEVELOPS LONG-RANGE AND DAILY PLANS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.071	*.012
Cooperating Teachers	**.071	1.000	.092
University Supervisors	*.012	.092	1.000

*p< .012 or .01 level of significance

**p< .071 or.07 level of significance

TABLE 38

OBTAINS APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.699	*.175
Cooperating Teachers	.699	1.000	**.374
University Supervisors	*.175	**.374	1.000

*p< .175 or .18 level of significance

**p< .374 or.37 level of significance

TABLE 39

CHOOSES APPROPRIATE STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.486	**.658
Cooperating Teachers	*.486	1.000	.932
University Supervisors	**.658	.932	1.000

*p< .486 or .49 level of significance

**p< .658 or.66 level of significance

TABLE 40

PRESENTS LESSONS EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.997	**.736
Cooperating Teachers	.997	1.000	*.690
University Supervisors	**.736	*.690	1.000

*p< .690 or .69 level of significance

**p< .736 or.74 level of significance

TABLE 41

MANAGES CLASSROOMS EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	1.000	**.628
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	1.000	*.615
University Supervisors	**.628	*.615	1.000

*p< .615 or .62 level of significance

**p< .628 or.63 level of significance

TABLE 42

MANAGES CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.818	*.289
Cooperating Teachers	.818	1.000	**.508
University Supervisors	*.289	**.508	1.000

*p< .289 or .29 level of significance

**p< .508 or.51 level of significance

TABLE 43

DEVELOPS APPROPRIATE EVALUATION DEVICES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.207	*.100
Cooperating Teachers	**.207	1.000	.674
University Supervisors	*.100	.674	1.000

*p< .100 or .10 level of significance

**p< .207 or.21 level of significance

TABLE 44

ASSESSES AND INTERPRETS STUDENT PROGRESS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.168	*.008
Cooperating Teachers	.168	1.000	**.025
University Supervisors	*.008	**.025	1.000

*p< .008 or .01 level of significance

**p< .025 or.03 level of significance

TABLE 45

WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS CULTURES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.999	**.396
Cooperating Teachers	.999	1.000	*.378
University Supervisors	**.396	*.378	1.000

*p< .378 or .38 level of significance

**p< .396 or.40 level of significance

TABLE 46

WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.669	*.205
Cooperating Teachers	.669	1.000	**.469
University Supervisors	*.205	**.469	1.000

*p< .205 or .21 level of significance

**p< .469 or.47 level of significance

TABLE 47

DEVELOPS RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.330	.359
Cooperating Teachers	**.330	1.000	*.086
University Supervisors	.359	*.086	1.000

*p< .086 or .09 level of significance

**p< .330 or.33 level of significance

TABLE 48

COUNSELS STUDENTS APPROPRIATELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.363	*.142
Cooperating Teachers	**.363	1.000	.587
University Supervisors	*.142	.587	1.000

*p< .142 or .14 level of significance

**p< .363 or.36 level of significance

TABLE 49

COOPERATES WITH ALL SCHOOL PERSONNEL

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.200	**.118
Cooperating Teachers	.200	1.000	*.027
University Supervisors	**.118	*.027	1.000

*p< .027 or .03 level of significance

**p< .118 or.12 level of significance

TABLE 50

MAINTAINS APPROPRIATE PERSONAL BEHAVIOR, SELF-CONTROL OPEN-MINDEDNESS, AND FLEXIBILITY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.862	**.190
Cooperating Teachers	.862	1.000	*.123
University Supervisors	**.190	*.123	1.000

*p< .123 or .12 level of significance

**p< .190 or .19 level of significance

APPENDIX C
TABLE 51
SUMMARY TABLE LISTING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

TABLE 51

SUMMARY SHOWING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE AMONG EVALUATORS OF FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

Competency Evaluated	Level of Significance	Evaluators Showing Greatest Variance Between Each Other
Practices Professional Ethics	.67	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Practices Professional Ethics	.81	University Super. - Student Teacher
Maintains Enthusiasm	.56	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Maintains Enthusiasm	.69	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Confidence in Ability	.99	University Super. - Student Teacher
Confidence in Ability	.99	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Professional Appearance	.72	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Professional Appearance	.79	University Super. - Student Teacher
Communicates Effectively	.20	University Super. - Student Teacher
Communicates Effectively	.42	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Professional Organizations	.86	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Professional Organizations	.94	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Profits from Suggestions	.83	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Profits from Suggestions	.94	University Super. - Student Teacher
Practices Punctuality	.14	University Super. - Student Teacher
Practices Punctuality	.33	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
School Activities	.03	University Super. - Student Teacher
School Activities	.12	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Resources for Development	.22	University Super. - Student Teacher
Resources for Development	.58	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Determines Student Needs	.66	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Determines Student Needs	.77	University Super. - Student Teacher

TABLE 51 CONTINUED

SUMMARY SHOWING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE AMONG EVALUATORS OF FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

Competency Evaluated	Level of Significance	Evaluators Showing Greatest Variance Between Each Other
Develops Lesson Plans	.01	University Super. - Student Teacher
Develops Lesson Plans	.07	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Resources for Teaching	.18	University Super. - Student Teacher
Resources for Teaching	.37	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Strategies for Teaching	.49	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Strategies for Teaching	.66	University Super. - Student Teacher
Presents Lesson Effectively	.69	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Presents Lesson Effectively	.74	University Super. - Student Teacher
Manages Classroom Facilities	.62	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Manages Classroom Facilities	.63	University Super. - Student Teacher
Manages Classroom Behavior	.29	University Super. - Student Teacher
Manages Classroom Behavior	.51	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Develops Evaluation Devices	.10	University Super. - Student Teacher
Develops Evaluation Devices	.21	University Super. - Student Teacher
Assesses Student Progress	.01	University Super. - Student Teacher
Assesses Student Progress	.03	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Works with Various Cultures	.38	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Works with Various Cultures	.40	University Super. - Student Teacher
Work with Exceptional Students	.21	University Super. - Student Teacher
Work with Exceptional Students	.47	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Develops Rapport	.09	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher

TABLE 51 CONTINUED

SUMMARY SHOWING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE AMONG EVALUATORS OF FALL 1987 AND SPRING 1988 STUDENT TEACHERS

Competency Evaluated	Level of Significance	Evaluators Showing Greatest Variance Between Each Other
Develops Rapport	.33	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Counsels Students Effectively	.14	University Super. - Student Teacher
Counsels Students Effectively	.36	Student Teacher - Cooperating Teacher
Cooperates with School	.03	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Cooperates with School	.12	University Super. - Student Teacher
Personal Behavior	.12	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Personal Behavior	.19	University Super. - Student Teacher

APPENDIX D
THE EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENTS

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: In order to evaluate your performance during student teaching, please rate your competence on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not perform a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics						
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching						
3. Confidence in ability to teach						
4. Maintain professional appearance						
5. Communicate effectively in classroom						
6. Participate in professional organization						
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions						
8. Practice punctuality						
9. Participate in school activities						
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons						
11. Determine student needs and interests						
12. Develop long-range and daily plans						
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching						
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching						
15. Present lessons effectively						
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively						
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively						
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices						
19. Assess and interpret student progress						
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures						
21. Work effectively with exceptional students						
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students						
23. Counsel students appropriately						
24. Cooperate with all school personnel						
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.						

Comments:

_____
Student's Signature

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: Rate the student teacher's performance on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not observe the student teacher in a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics						
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching						
3. Confidence in ability to teach						
4. Maintain professional appearance						
5. Communicate effectively in classroom						
6. Participate in professional organization						
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions						
8. Practice punctuality						
9. Participate in school activities						
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons						
11. Determine student needs and interests						
12. Develop long-range and daily plans						
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching						
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching						
15. Present lessons effectively						
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively						
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively						
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices						
19. Assess and interpret student progress						
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures						
21. Work effectively with exceptional students						
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students						
23. Counsel students appropriately						
24. Cooperate with all school personnel						
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.						

Comments:

_____
Cooperating Teacher

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: Rate the student teacher's performance on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not observe the student teacher in a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics	___	___	___	___	___	___
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
3. Confidence in ability to teach	___	___	___	___	___	___
4. Maintain professional appearance	___	___	___	___	___	___
5. Communicate effectively in classroom	___	___	___	___	___	___
6. Participate in professional organization	___	___	___	___	___	___
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions	___	___	___	___	___	___
8. Practice punctuality	___	___	___	___	___	___
9. Participate in school activities	___	___	___	___	___	___
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons	___	___	___	___	___	___
11. Determine student needs and interests	___	___	___	___	___	___
12. Develop long-range and daily plans	___	___	___	___	___	___
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
15. Present lessons effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices	___	___	___	___	___	___
19. Assess and interpret student progress	___	___	___	___	___	___
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures	___	___	___	___	___	___
21. Work effectively with exceptional students	___	___	___	___	___	___
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students	___	___	___	___	___	___
23. Counsel students appropriately	___	___	___	___	___	___
24. Cooperate with all school personnel	___	___	___	___	___	___
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.	___	___	___	___	___	___

Comments:

_____
University Supervisor